



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/690,243	10/17/2000	Ari Engelberg	36530/RRT/S850	2962
23363 7590 11/26/2008 CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP PO BOX 7068 PASADENA, CA 91109-7068				
EXAMINER				
ELISCA, PIERRE E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/26/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/690,243

Applicant(s)

ENGELBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Pierre E. Elisca

Art Unit

3621

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8, 10-40 and 42-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8, 10-38, 48 and 72-79 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39, 40, 42-47 and 49-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 08/20/2008.
2. Claims 1-4, 8, 10-40, and 42-79 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 39-40, 42-47, 49, and 50-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitehouse (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,945 (*applicant submitted IDS*) in view of Pang et al (U.S. Patent No 6,446,204).

As per claim 39, Whitehouse teach a method for printing value-beating items (VBI) via a communication network including a client system and a server system the method comprising receiving a printing request from a user using the client system over the communication network, storing in a database a plurality of security device transaction data records, ensuring authenticity of the one or more users, utilizing a respective security device transaction data record (*see figs 3, 4, column 7 line 54-8 line 11 also see fig 4, column 8 lines 23-29, 54-58, 9 line 15-19*). Whitehouse fail to teach a system for processing in a stateless manner each security device transaction data

record in the server system and authenticating by a scalable cryptographic module the one or more users utilizing one or more of the plurality of security device transaction data record stored in the database, cross-verifying a copy of the last transaction data record stored in the database and stored in an available cryptographic device, before processing the VBI printing request from the user, authenticating the user by the cryptographic device in a stateless manner utilizing a respective one-of the plurality of transaction data record stored in the database, and printing a VBI requested by the user. However, Pang et al teach a system for processing in a stateless manner each security device transaction data record in the server system and authenticating by a scalable cryptographic module the one or more users utilizing one or more of the plurality of security device transaction data record stored in the database (*see abstract, figs 2, 6 and 8, column 23 lines 26-64, 25 lines 1-20*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Whitehouse et al's invention to include Pangs et al's system for processing in a stateless manner each security device transaction data record in the server system and authenticating by a scalable cryptographic module the one or more users utilizing one or more of the plurality of security device transaction data record stored in the database because this would have ensure that client would be properly authenticate whenever service is needed thereby enhance the flexibility of the system.

As per claim 40, Whitehouse teaches a method wherein each security device transaction data is related to a user (*see column 9 lines 12-20*).

As per claim 42, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising of updating and returning the security device transaction data related to a user to the database (see *column 9 line 51-63, 12 line 53-56*).

As per claim 43, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising adding at least one more stateless cryptographic module, wherein each cryptographic module is capable of processing any of the plurality of security device transaction data (see *column 9 line 51-63*).

As per claim 44, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising of authenticating a user using any of the cryptographic modules (see *column 9 line 51-63*).

As per claim 45, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising load-balancing to route user requests to the at least one more cryptographic module see *column 19 line 35-20 line 8*).

As per claim 46, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising load-balancing to distribute traffic among the multiple cryptographic modules see *column 19 line 35-20 line 8*).

As per claim 47, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising authenticating any of the one or more users using the cryptographic module (*see column 9 line 51-63*).

As per claim 49, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising encrypting database transactions using the cryptographic module (*see column 10 line 45-60*).

As per claim 50, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising verifying a user password before granting access to the database (*see column 15 line 1-17*).

As per claim 51, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising storing one or more last database transactions in the database storing one or more last database transactions in the cryptographic module; and comparing the one or more last database transactions stored in the database with the one or more last database transactions stored in the cryptographic module to verify each database transaction (*see column 16 line 45-67*).

As per claim 52, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising encrypting transactions related to the database using the cryptographic module (*see column 15 line 1-17*).

As per claim 53, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising storing one or more last database transactions in the database, storing one or more last database

transactions in the cryptographic module for comparison with the one or more last database transactions stored in the database to verify each database transaction (*see column 10 line 45-60*).

As per claim 54, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising preventing further database transactions if the one or more last transaction stored in the cryptographic module does not compare with the one or more last transaction stored in the database (*see column 8 line 63-9 line 12*).

As per claim 55, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising preventing unauthorized modification of data using the cryptographic module (*see column 16 line 45-67*).

As per claim 56, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising verifying that the database is up to date (*see column 10 line 45-60*).

As per claim 57, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising automatically re-synchronizing the cryptographic module with the database (*see column 9 line 51-63*).

As per claim 58, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising ensuring the proper operation of cryptographic security and VBI related meter functions (*see column 9 lines 12-20*).

As per claim 59, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising supporting multiple concurrent operators (*see fig 7*).

As per claim 60, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising storing information about a number of last transactions in a respective internal register of each of the one or more cryptographic devices, storing a table including the information about a last transaction in the database, comparing the information saved in the respective device with the respective information saved in the database; and loading a new transaction data if the respective information stored in the device compares with the respective information stored in the database (*see column 10 line 45-11 line 25*).

As per claim 61, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising the step of storing data for creating one or more indicium, account maintenance, and revenue protection (*see column 10 line 45-11 line 25*).

As per claims 62-65, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising printing a mail piece includes a digital signature, a postage amount, an ascending register of used postage and descending register of available postage (*see column 13 lines 20-40, 14 line 25-36, 16 lines 19-38*).

As per claims 66-71, Whitehouse teaches a method further comprising printing a ticket, a bar code, a coupon, currency, a voucher, a traveler's check (*see column 7 line 46-53, 8 line 14-18, 13 lines 56-60*).

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 39-40, 42-47, 49, and 50-71 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 1-4, 8, 10-38, 48, and 72-79 are allowed over the prior art of record.

REMARKS

7. In response to Applicant's filed on 08/20/2008, Applicant argues that the prior art of record (Whitehouse 945" and Pang 204") fail to teach:

a. cross-verifying a copy of the last transaction data record stored in the database and stored in an available cryptographic device, before processing the VBI printing request from the user, authenticating the user by the cryptographic device in a stateless manner utilizing a respective one-of the plurality of transaction data record stored in the database, and printing a VBI requested by the user. However, Pang et al teach a system for processing in a stateless manner each security device transaction data record in the server system and authenticating by a scalable cryptographic module the one or more users utilizing one or more of the plurality of security device transaction

data record stored in the database (*see abstract, figs 2, 6 and 8, column 23 lines 26-64, 25 lines 1-20*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Whitehouse et al's invention to include Pangs et al's system for processing in a stateless manner each security device transaction data record in the server system and authenticating by a scalable cryptographic module the one or more users utilizing one or more of the plurality of security device transaction data record stored in the database because this would have ensure that client would be properly authenticate whenever service is needed thereby enhance the flexibility of the system

b. "wherein when a VBI printing request from a current user is received by the server system, an available cryptographic device from the plurality of cryptographic devices loads the current user's transaction data record and instantiates a user state in the transaction data record to process the VBI printing requests from the current user". However, it is the Examiner believes that whitehouse discloses Applicant's newly added limitation described above in *figs 3, 4, column 7 line 54-8 line 11 also see fig 4, column 8 lines 23-29, 54-58, 9 line 15-19*).

c. a stateless cryptographic module to authenticate any of the plurality of users using one or more of the plurality of security device transaction data records of stored in the database, in a stateless manner". As indicated above, the Examiner believes that Whitehouse fail to teach scalable server system capable of communicating with the client system over a communication network wherein the scalable server system is configured to process each security device transaction data record can be processed in

a stateless manner; an a stateless cryptographic module to authenticate the users using the plurality of security device transaction data records stored in the database.

However, Pang et al teach scalable server system capable of communicating with the client system over a communication network wherein the scalable server system is configured to process each security device transaction data record can be processed in a stateless manner; an a stateless cryptographic module to authenticate the users using the plurality of security device transaction data records stored in the database (*see abstract, figs 2, 6 and 8, column 23 lines 26-64, 25 lines 1-20*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Whitehouse et al. disclosure to include Pang et al scalable server system capable of communicating with the client system over a communication network wherein the scalable server system is configured to process each security device transaction data record can be processed in a stateless manner; an a stateless cryptographic module to authenticate the users using the plurality of security device transaction data records stored in the database because this would have ensure that client would be properly authenticate whenever service is needed thereby enhance the flexibility of the system.

d. Applicant further argues that there is any disclosure in Pang about the authentication engines 802, 804, and 806 being stateless and being able to authenticate. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's characterization of the prior art. Pang discloses a distributed application server that provides for extensible authentication mechanism in a stateless web environment (*see., figs 7A, 7B, and fig 8, the system of*

Pang, fig 8 has been performed in a stateless web environment, and therefore, Applicant argument is moot).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre E. Elisca whose telephone number is 571 272 6706. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 to 5:00. Hotelier.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on 571 272 6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ Pierre E. Elisca/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3621